

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

Christopher Wright,	:	
	:	
Petitioner(s),	:	
	:	Case Number: 1:15cv123
vs.	:	
	:	Judge Susan J. Dlott
Warden, Noble Correctional Institution,	:	
	:	
Respondent(s).	:	

ORDER

This matter is before the Court pursuant to the Order of General Reference in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio Western Division to United States Magistrate Judge Stephanie K. Bowman. Pursuant to such reference, the Magistrate Judge reviewed the pleadings and filed with this Court on February 11, 2016 a Report and Recommendation (Doc. 32). Subsequently, the petitioner filed objections to such Report and Recommendation (Doc. 38 and 39). The Petitioner also filed a motion for the district judge to recuse (Doc. 37).

The Court has reviewed the comprehensive findings of the Magistrate Judge and considered de novo all of the filings in this matter. Upon consideration of the foregoing, the Court does determine that such Recommendation should be adopted.

Accordingly, respondent's motion to dismiss (Doc. 12) is GRANTED and petitioner's petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. 7) is DISMISSED with prejudice on the ground that the petition is time-barred under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d).

A certificate of appealability will not issue with respect to any of the claims for relief alleged in the petition, which this Court had concluded are barred from review on a procedural

ground, because under the first prong of the two-part standard enunciated in *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000), “jurists of reason” will not find it debatable whether the Court is correct in its procedural ruling.

With respect to any application by petitioner to proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis*, the Court will certify pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(a)(3) that an appeal of any Order adopting the Report and Recommendation will not be taken in “good faith,” therefore petitioner is DENIED leave to appeal *in forma pauperis* upon a showing of financial necessity. *See* Fed. R. App.P. 24(a); *King v. Sparkman*, 117 F.3d 949,952 (6th Cir. 1997).

The Court DENIES petitioner’s motion for the district judge to recuse (Doc. 37).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Susan J. Dlott
Judge Susan J. Dlott
United States District Court